

1 **FINAL**

2  
3 **MINUTES OF THE COTTONWOOD HEIGHTS CITY**  
4 **PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

5  
6 **Wednesday, April 16, 2008**

7 **7:00 p.m.**

8 **Cottonwood Heights City Council Room**  
9 **1265 East Fort Union Boulevard, Suite 300**  
10 **Cottonwood Heights, Utah**

11  
12 ***ATTENDANCE***

13  
14 **Planning Commission Members:**

**City Staff:**

15  
16 Gordon Nicholl, Chairman  
17 Geoff Armstrong  
18 Perry Bolyard, Alternate  
19 J. Thomas Bowen  
20 JoAnn Frost  
21 Jerri Harwell, Alternate  
22 Doug Haymore  
23 Jim Keane  
24 Amy Rosevear

Michael Black, Planning Director

25  
26 **REGULAR MEETING**

27  
28 **1. Welcome/Acknowledgements.**

29  
30 Chairman Gordon Nicholl called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. He reported that the flag lot  
31 issue on 2300 East was removed from the agenda. The matter would most likely be heard at the  
32 next meeting scheduled for the third Wednesday in May. Planning Director, Michael Black,  
33 commented that staff cannot foresee every potential problem. He thought it was better to remove a  
34 matter from the agenda than put it on when there are problems with it.

35  
36 (19:00:45) Mr. Black invited interested citizens to contact him at any time for information on the  
37 matter. He reported that a property owner was attempting to create a flag lot. There were issues  
38 that came up with regard to the driveway easement crossing property lines. After that meeting,  
39 other property owners who were attempting to do the same thing were contacted and the issue was  
40 postponed. Currently on the property there were existing lots. The request was to create a third lot  
41 in the rear with a driveway running between two duplexes on 2300 East. There would be a single-  
42 family home built in the rear where the existing home is currently situated. Mr. Black apologized to  
43 those who were present who were not notified that the item was cancelled.

44  
45 Mr. Black stated that the situation involved a standard subdivision that is somewhat a permitted use.  
46 The request would involve the subdivision of property. He explained that the property could be

1 sold after it is subdivided and someone else could build within the guidelines of the code. The code  
2 would allow two duplexes in the front on the two lots because the zoning is R-2-8. The back lot  
3 would not allow duplexes. Only a single-family home would be allowed with a maximum height of  
4 27 feet with at least a 20-foot setback from every property line.

## 5 6 **2. Citizen Comments.**

7  
8 There were no citizen comments.  
9

## 10 **3. Reports/Presentations.**

### 11 **3.1 Report on R-1-8 Zoning Amendment. Modifying Setbacks for Accessory Structures.**

12  
13 (19:07:00) Mr. Black stated that the amendment involved all of the residential zones in the City  
14 other than the R-2-8. They were looking at the side and rear setbacks for accessory buildings and  
15 conditional uses. The Commission Members were encouraged to look closely at the conditional  
16 uses and identify any concerns with Mr. Black. Mr. Black reported that there were at least four  
17 ordinances under review presently. Staff was trying to keep them moving through the process. The  
18 next meeting was expected to be fairly significant.  
19

### 20 **3.2 Report on Upcoming Public Hearings.**

21  
22 (19:08:10) Mr. Black reviewed the upcoming public hearings. He reported that he still needed  
23 information on the 1976 Supplementary Qualifying Regulations and commented that this section of  
24 the code was significant. With regard to 19.90 amendments to the zoning, Mr. Black did not expect  
25 to hear anything, as he did not think there was anything else to discuss. The City was simply  
26 coming into compliance with LUDMA. The last issue was discussed earlier in the meeting.  
27

## 28 **4. Action Items.**

### 29 **4.1 No Items Scheduled.**

## 30 31 **5. Approval of Minutes.**

### 32 **5.1 April 2, 2008, Planning Commission Meeting.**

33  
34 (19:09:07) *Commissioner Keane moved to approve the minutes as written. Commissioner Frost*  
35 *seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Gordon Nicholl-Aye, Geoff Armstrong-Aye, J. Thomas*  
36 *Bowen-Aye, JoAnn Frost-Aye, Doug Haymore-Aye, Jim Keane-Aye, Amy Rosevear-Aye. The*  
37 *motion passed.*  
38

## 39 **6. Planning Director's Report.**

40  
41 (19:09:21) Mr. Black reiterated that the next Planning Commission Meeting was scheduled for May  
42 21, 2008. He spoke with Neil Stowe from the Architectural Review Commission who is in charge  
43 of the first phase of the redevelopment of downtown Salt Lake City. They planned to meet either in  
44 late May or June. Mr. Black proposed that the Commission meet with Mr. Stowe on a Wednesday  
45 and conduct a work session meeting. It was expected that the discussion would last two to four

1 hours and the discussion would focus on the architectural review in the Gateway Zone and what  
2 items should be guidelines and which should be standards.

3  
4 Chair Nicholl suggested the meeting commence around 6:00 p.m.

5  
6 Mr. Black realized it was frustrating for citizens to come to the meeting and discover that the main  
7 item has been cancelled. He did, however, want to explain the situation to those present.  
8 Commissioner Keane thought the citizens want to be treated with respect and not made to feel like  
9 they are being taken advantage of by government. Because the City is small, he thought they tried  
10 hard to deal with citizens face-to-face. He could see that the citizens were satisfied when they left.  
11 Mr. Black stated that any citizen would be treated in a similar fashion.

12  
13 Chair Nicholl noted that in the business meeting Mr. Black gave the Commission Members a good  
14 synopsis of the progress being made on the new Walgreen's store and the concerns about the wall  
15 on 2300 East and Fort Union Boulevard. The Commission would be very cognizant of what is  
16 going on there and watch it closely.

17  
18 Mr. Black gave an update on the "pork chop" situation. He asked City Engineer, Brad Gilson, to  
19 meet with the owners, which he did. They came up with some options that they believed might  
20 work. One possible solution would involve adding vertical cones with a reflector on the top. It  
21 would be a temporary fix. If it works, however, it could potentially be a permanent fix. Mr. Black  
22 stated that the best solution would be to remove some of the landscaping and create a dedicated  
23 right turn lane. He suggested the first option be experimented with first. If it does not work, the  
24 City would be justified in going back to the applicants and indicating that the access cannot be  
25 controlled with anything other than what the City determines.

26  
27 (19:13:23) Mr. Black commented that Fort Union Boulevard was being redone from 1300 East to  
28 Highland Drive. A true fix would be to install an unmountable median in the middle of the road. It  
29 would still allow a left turn lane but would not allow a car to go over it. Mr. Black thought it would  
30 be difficult to force the applicants into building the right turn lane. If people are willing to break the  
31 law, the applicants have no control over that. He did not view compliance with the law as the  
32 responsibility of the business owner. Chair Nicholl stated that it was made evident by the applicant  
33 that it is a left turn only access. He believed the applicants had done everything necessary to meet  
34 the standard of law on that issue. If the applicants work with the City to facilitate making it a little  
35 bit better, that would be great. If, however, the City pushes the applicants, they could tie the City  
36 up for a long time.

37  
38 Mr. Black stated that the City Engineer's opinion was that the concrete strip on the edge of the left  
39 turn lane would fix the situation completely. It would still allow motorists to turn left into the site  
40 but they would have to go the opposite direction of traffic and then turn up through the left turn lane  
41 in order to make that movement. Mr. Black realized the City still had options and they were  
42 working with the applicant to resolve.

43  
44 A Commissioner asked if there would be a moratorium on utilities once the resurfacing of Fort  
45 Union Boulevard is complete. She asked if that was a standard. She had heard that West Jordan  
46 goes seven years and gives the utilities 18 to 24 months' notice. In the future she asked if the City

1 could extend the moratorium out so that utilities can't come behind shortly after and dig a long  
2 trench in the road. Mr. Black suggested the matter be addressed with Kevin Smith.

3  
4 **7. Adjournment.**

5  
6 (19:20:40) *Commissioner Armstrong moved to adjourn. Commissioner Bowen seconded the*  
7 *motion. Vote on motion: Gordon Nicholl-Aye, Geoff Armstrong-Aye, J. Thomas Bowen-Aye,*  
8 *JoAnn Frost-Aye, Doug Haymore-Aye, Jim Keane-Aye, Amy Rosevear-Aye. The motion passed.*

9  
10 The Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at 7:20 p.m.

1 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate and complete record of the*  
2 *Cottonwood Heights City Planning Commission meeting held Wednesday, April 16, 2008.*

3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 

9 Teri Forbes  
10 T Forbes Group  
11 Minutes Secretary

12  
13  
14 Minutes approved: